



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/965,117	09/26/2001	Sean R. Parent	07844-471001 / P435	1762
21876	7590	08/19/2005	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. P.O. Box 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			MEUCCI, MICHAEL D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2142	

DATE MAILED: 08/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/965,117

Applicant(s)

PARENT ET AL.

Examiner

Michael D. Meucci

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 September 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This application has been reassigned to Michael Meucci.
2. This action is in response to the request for reconsideration filed 15 June 2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a. The examiner suggests replacing "understood" on line 3 of the claim with --recognized--. Computers inherently cannot understand *anything* and rely solely on human input for decision-making processes.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-2, 4, 6-8, 10-13, 23-25 and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stent (U.S. 5,778,359) in view of Backlund (OOE: A Compound Document Framework).

a. With respect to claim 1, Stent discloses receiving a foreign data block (col. 3, lines 9-11); determining characteristics of the foreign data block (col. 2, line 1); and generating packing data that describes the characteristics of the foreign data block, including data marking the beginning (col. 3, lines 50-52; col. 5, lines 16-18) and end of the foreign data block (col. 3, lines 53-54) and further including an identifier designed to be distinguishable from all other data in the host data file (col. 2, line 9 and col. 3, lines 49-56).

Stent does not expressly disclose receiving a host data file, the host data file having a host data file format; embedding the packing data and the foreign data block as a foreign data block packet in the host data file; whereby the foreign data block is identifiable, extractable, and modifiable by computer programs not configured to recognize the host file data format.

Backlund teaches a host data file having a host data file format (p. 2, lines 23-24) into which foreign files can be embedded wherein the foreign data block is identifiable, extractable, and modifiable by application programs that are not configured to recognize the host file data format (p. 2, lines 29-33).

Stent and Backlund are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor of document processing.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Stent's method of encapsulating data to produce packets that could be embedded into a host file using Backlund's method of creating compound documents. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide Backlund's method with packets that contain a large amount of information about the contained data.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Backlund with Stent for the benefit of packets containing a large amount of data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

b. With respect to claims 2 and 23, Stent further discloses that generating packing data includes generating a header for the foreign data block, the header including the identifier and indicating the beginning of the foreign data block packet (col. 3, line 50) and the beginning of the foreign data block (col. 3, lines 50-52; col. 5, lines 16-18).

c. With respect to claims 4 and 24, Stent further discloses that generating packing data includes generating a trailer for the foreign data block, the trailer indicating the end of the foreign data block (col. 3, lines 53-54).

d. With respect to claims 6 and 25, Stent further discloses including padding in the foreign data block packet to allow in-place modifications of the foreign data block that cause the foreign data block to expand (col. 4, line 7).

e. With respect to claim 7, Stent further discloses that determining characteristics of the foreign data block includes determining a size of the foreign data

block (col. 4, lines 3-5); and the amount of padding is a function of the size of the foreign data block (col. 4, lines 5-7).

f. With respect to claim 8, Backlund further discloses that the foreign data block is a data block not native to the host file format (p. 2, lines 16-18).

g. With respect to claims 10 and 27, Stent further discloses that determining characteristics of the foreign data block includes determining a byte order (col. 4, lines 21-23) and an encoding format of the foreign data block (col. 4, lines 32-33); and generating a header includes generating a header that includes information for specifying the byte order and encoding format of the foreign data block, the encoding format being one of an 8, 16, or 32 bit Unicode format (col. 4, lines 32-33).

h. With respect to claims 11 and 28, Stent further disclose that generating an identifier includes generating a different identifier for each different type of foreign data block when there are multiple types of foreign data blocks in the host data file (col. 2, lines 7-9).

i. With respect to claim 12, Stent further discloses that the foreign data block includes metadata information that describes the host data file (col. 2, lines 7-9).

j. With respect to claim 13, Backlund further discloses that receiving a host data file includes receiving a host data file having a non-XML format (p. 2, line 16).

6. Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stent (U.S. 5,778,359) in view of Lonnroth et al. (U.S. 6,826,597 B1) hereinafter referred to as Lonnroth.

a. With respect to claim 14, Stent discloses: scanning for a header (col. 2, lines 19-21) that indicates the beginning of an embedded foreign data block packet that contains a foreign data block (col. 3, lines 50-52), the foreign data block having a format that is recognizable by the computer program (col. 2, lines 7-9), the header including an identifier designed to be distinguishable from all other data in the host data file (col. 2, line 9 and col. 5, lines 47-52), the header further describing the characteristics of the foreign data block (col. 3, lines 50-51); and processing the header when the header is located (col. 2, lines 22-23).

Stent teaches receiving a host data file, but does not explicitly teach the host data file having a host data file format that is not understood by the computer program product, but provides evidence for such on col. 1, line 66 – col. 2, line 1. Lonroth does teach receiving a host data file wherein the host data file has a host data file format that is not understood by the computer program product. “The present invention relates to providing services to clients and, more specifically, to providing clients with services that retrieve data from data sources that do not necessarily support the format required by the clients,” (lines 20-23 of column 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant’s invention to have a data file with a host data file format that is not understood by the computer program product. “In one embodiment, the request objects are XML-structured documents with unresolved links to the data sources that have information required by the clients. An XML processor resolves the links by issuing requests through one or more gateways. The gateways convert the responses received from the data sources into XML, which the XML

processor uses to create XML composite response documents. A post-processor filters the XML response documents, and applies XSL stylesheets to transform the XML composite response documents into client-specific responses that conform to the format required by the clients," (lines 19-30 of column 3 in Lonnroth). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have a data file with a host data file format that is not understood by the computer program product and also be able to utilize this information in the system as taught by Stent.

b. With respect to claim 15, Stent discloses instructions to process the foreign data block (col. 2, lines 26-27).

c. With respect to claim 16, Stent discloses instructions to stop processing the foreign data block when a trailer is detected, wherein the trailer indicates the end of the foreign data block (col. 3, lines 53-54).

7. Claims 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stent and Lonnroth as applied to claim 16 above, further in view of Backlund.

a. With respect to claim 17, Stent discloses instructions to ensure that the modified foreign data block fits in the foreign data block packet (col. 4, lines 7-9).

Stent does not expressly disclose instructions to modify the foreign data clock as specified by a user; and re-embed the modified foreign data block in place of the original foreign data block.

Backlund discloses the capability to allow user modifications of a foreign data block (p. 2, lines 29-30) and that the modified data block can be re-embedded in place of the original data block (p. 8, lines 3-7).

Stent and Backlund are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor of document processing.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Stent's method of processing data to produce packets that could be embedded into a host file using Backlund's method of creating and modifying compound documents. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide Backlund's method with packets that contain a large amount of information about the contained data.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Backlund with Stent for the benefit of packets containing a large amount of data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 17.

b. With respect to claim 18, Stent discloses instructions to ensure that the re-written foreign data block packet is the same size as the original foreign data block packet (col. 4, lines 7-9).

Stent does not expressly disclose instructions to modify the foreign data clock as specified by a user; rewrite the foreign data block packet; and re-embed the modified foreign data block in place of the original foreign data block.

Backlund discloses the capability to allow user modifications of a foreign data block (p. 2, lines 29-30), the capability to rewrite the foreign data block packet (p. 8, line

5), and that the modified data block can be re-embedded in place of the original data block packet (p. 8, lines 3-7).

Stent and Backlund are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor of document processing.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Stent's method of processing data to produce packets that could be embedded into a host file using Backlund's method of creating and modifying compound documents. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide Backlund's method with packets that contain a large amount of information about the contained data.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Backlund with Stent for the benefit of packets containing a large amount of data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 18.

8. Claims 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Backlund (OOE: A Compound Document Framework) in view of Stent (5,778,359).

a. With respect to claim 19, Backlund discloses a method for embedding a foreign data block in a host data file, comprising:

receiving a host data file, the host data file having a host data format (p. 2, lines 23-24);

receiving a packet to be embedded into the host data file (p. 2, lines 27-28);

embedding the packet in the host data file (p. 2, lines 29-33);

whereby the foreign data block is identifiable, extractable, and modifiable by computer programs not configured to recognize the host file data format (p. 2, lines 29-30).

Backlund does not expressly disclose that the foreign data block includes a header and a trailer that delimit the foreign data block, the header including an identifier designed to be distinguishable from all other data in the host data file.

Stent discloses a header (col. 3, lines 50-52; col. 5, lines 16-18) and a trailer that delimit the foreign data block (col. 3, lines 53-54) and an identifier designed to be distinguishable from all other data in the host data file (col. 2, line 9).

Stent and Backlund are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor of document processing.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Stent's method of encapsulating data to produce packets that could be embedded into a host file using Backlund's method of creating compound documents. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide Backlund's method with packets that contain a large amount of information about the contained data.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Backlund with Stent for the benefit of packets containing a large amount of data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 19.

b. With respect to claim 20, Backlund discloses A computer program product, tangibly stored on a machine-readable medium, for embedding a foreign data

block in a host data file, comprising instructions operable to cause a programmable processor to:

receive a host data file, the host data file having a host data format that is a native file format for the computer program product (p. 2, lines 23-24);

receive a packet to be embedded into the host data file, the packet including a foreign data block that is not native to the host data file format (p. 2, lines 27-28); and

embed the packet in the host data file (p. 2, lines 29-33);

whereby the foreign data block is identifiable, extractable, and modifiable by computer programs not configured to recognize the host file data format (p. 2, lines 29-30).

Backlund does not expressly disclose a header and a trailer that delimit the foreign data block, the header including an identifier that is designed to be distinguishable from all other data in the host data file.

Stent discloses a header (col. 3, lines 50-52; col. 5, lines 16-18) and a trailer that delimit the foreign data block (col. 3, lines 53-54) and an identifier designed to be distinguishable from all other data in the host data file (col. 2, line 9).

Stent and Backlund are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor of document processing.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Stent's method of encapsulating data to produce packets that could be embedded into a host file using Backlund's method of creating compound documents.

The motivation for doing so would have been to provide Backlund's method with packets that contain a large amount of information about the contained data.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Backlund with Stent for the benefit of packets containing a large amount of data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 20.

c. With respect to claim 21, Backlund discloses a computer program product, tangibly stored on a machine-readable medium, for embedding a foreign data block in a host data file, comprising instructions operable to cause a programmable processor to:

receive a host data file, the host data file having a host data file format that is a native file format for a host application (p. 2, lines 23-24);

receive a foreign data block, the foreign data block being a data block that is not native to the host data file format (p. 2, lines 27-28); and

embed the information and the foreign data block as a foreign data block packet in the host data file (p. 2, lines 29-33);

whereby the foreign data block is identifiable, extractable, and modifiable by computer programs not configured to recognize the host file data format (p. 2, lines 29-30).

Backlund does not disclose instructions to generate information that describes the characteristics of the foreign data block, including information marking the beginning and end of the foreign data block and further including an identifier designed to be distinguishable from all other data in the host data file.

Stent discloses instructions for determining characteristics of the foreign data block (col. 2, line 1) and information marking the beginning and end of the foreign data block (col. 3, lines 50-52; col. 5, lines 16-18; col. 3, lines 53-54) and an identifier designed to be distinguishable from all other data in the host data file (col. 2, line 9).

Stent and Backlund are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor of document processing.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Stent's instructions for encapsulating data to produce packets that could be embedded into a host file using Backlund's program for creating compound documents. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide Backlund's method with packets that contain a large amount of information about the contained data.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Backlund with Stent for the benefit of packets containing a large amount of data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 21.

d. With respect to claim 22, Backlund discloses a computer program product, tangibly stored on a machine-readable medium, for embedding metadata in a host data file having a non-XML format, comprising instructions operable to cause a programmable processor to:

receive a host data file having a format that is not XML and that is a native file format for a host application (p. 2, lines 23-24, 16);

receive metadata having a format that is not native to the host data file format (p. 2, lines 27-28); and

embed the information and the metadata as a packet in the host data file (p. 2, lines 29-33);

whereby the metadata is identifiable, extractable, and modifiable by computer programs not configured to recognize the host file data format (p. 2, lines 29-30).

Backlund does not expressly disclose instructions to determine characteristics of the metadata and generate information that describes the characteristics of the metadata, including information marking the beginning and end of the metadata and further including an identifier designed to be distinguishable from all other data in the host data file.

Stent discloses instructions to determine characteristics of the metadata (col. 2, line 1) and information marking the beginning and end of the metadata (col. 3, lines 50-52; col. 5, lines 16-18; col. 3, lines 53-54) and an identifier designed to be distinguishable from all other data in the host data file (col. 2, line 9).

Stent and Backlund are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor of document processing.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Stent's instructions for encapsulating data to produce packets that could be embedded into a host file using Backlund's program for creating compound documents. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide Backlund's

Art Unit: 2142

method with packets that contain a large amount of information about the contained data.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Backlund with Stent for the benefit of packets containing a large amount of data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 22.

9. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stent in view of Backlund as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of Erickson (2004/0210535) and Parks (6,850,228).

Stent and Backlund do not expressly disclose a header that indicates the end of the foreign data block packet.

Erickson indicates that the data block can be at the end of an encapsulated document (par. 93). Parks shows that a header can indicate the length (and therefore the end) of a data block (col. 2, line 16). If the data block is at the end of the document, as taught by Erickson, the Parks' length would indicate the end of the document. Therefore, Erickson and Parks show that a header can indicate the end of a foreign data block packet.

Stent, Backlund, Erickson, and Parks are all analogous art because they are all from the same field of endeavor of document processing.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to allow Stent's method to include a header that indicates the end of the foreign

Art Unit: 2142

data block packet. The motivation for doing so would have been to indicate to Backlund's method the end of the packet to be embedded.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Erickson and Parks with Stent and Backlund for the benefit of additional information about the packet to be embedded to obtain the invention as specified in claim 3.

10. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stent in View of Backlund as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of Parks (6,850,228).

Stent and Backlund do not expressly disclose a header that indicates the end of the foreign data block.

Parks teaches that headers can indicate the length, and therefore the end, of a data block (col. 2, line 16).

Stent, Backlund, and Parks are all analogous art because they are all from the same field of endeavor of document processing.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to allow Stent's method to include a header that indicates the end of the foreign data block. The motivation for doing so would have been to indicate to Backlund's method the end of the block to be embedded.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Parks with Stent and Backlund for the benefit of additional information about the block to be embedded to obtain the invention as specified in claim 5.

11. Claims 9 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stent in view of Backlund as applied to claims 1 and 21 above, and further in view of Walsh (6,810,429).

Backlund discloses that the host file is in a non-XML format (p. 2, line 16).

Stent and Backlund do not expressly disclose that the foreign data block is an XML document.

Walsh discloses that XML documents can be embedded into documents of a different type (col. 13, lines 18-20).

Stent, Backlund, and Walsh are all analogous art because they are all from the same field of endeavor of document processing.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to allow Backlund's method to accept an XML document as a document to be embedded into a non-XML file. The motivation for doing so would have been to broaden the types of files that Backlund's method can accept as embedded data.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Walsh with Stent and Backlund for the benefit of broadening the types of files that Backlund's method can accept to obtain the invention as specified in claims 9 and 26.

Response to Arguments

12. (A) Applicant's arguments, see paragraphs 1-2 under Section 102 Rejections on pages 11-12, filed 15 June 2005, with respect to the rejection of claim 14 under 35

U.S.C. §102 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Lonnroth. See above for new rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

13. (B) Applicant's arguments, see paragraphs 3-4 under Section 102 Rejections on page 12, with respect to the rejection of claims 14. The arguments pertaining to the "scanning" step are not persuasive.

As to point (B), the examiner points to lines 46-52 of column 5 in Stent which discloses: "This analysis will often take place immediately after a carriage return, new line or linefeed, since many records often start with a unique record identifier (ID), such as field 36, FIG. 2. Should a unique record ID or a standard record ID be discovered, as shown by arrow 46, FIG. 3 this pattern is determined to be a record ID field 36 throughout file 16." This section of Stent clearly discloses scanning for a "unique record ID" which is distinguishable from all other data in the host data file. Header files are very well known in the art as well and are taught in the previous citations in Stent so as to reasonably convey the remaining limitations of claim 14.

14. (C) Applicant contends that Stent and Backlund do not teach the constraints of claim 1. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

As to point (C), the applicant states that Stent does not disclose that the file types are included in packing data that describes characteristics of the foreign data block. The examiner points directly to lines 49-56 of column 3 in Stent as cited in the previous

office action. This section teaches that the header contains information about the contents of the file (see lines 50-52 specifically) which includes a foreign data block.

The applicant also states that Stent does not teach that a file type constitutes an identifier designed to be distinguishable from all other data in the host file. This limitation has been addressed already in point (B) above and also applies to claim 1.

As to the applicant's arguments that Backlund does not disclose that the editable embedded object includes the claimed packing data and identifier, the examiner points out that Stent, in fact, discloses these limitations and that Backlund was incorporated as a secondary reference to teach the *embedding* of the packing data and identifiers taught by Stent.

15. (D) Applicant argues limitations in claim 19 which have been discussed above regarding claims 1 and 14.

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Moore et al. (U.S. 5,528,742) discloses processing documents with embedded fonts.

Geary (U.S. 6,070,160) discloses non-linear database set searching apparatus.

Sarkar (U.S. 6,418,448 B1) discloses embedding metadata in XML documents.

Slaughter et al. (U.S. 6,643,650 B1) discloses resource management with embedded XML metadata.

Freishtat et al. (U.S. 2001/0037415 A1) discloses XML and embedding in webpages.

Jordan (U.S. 2002/0069157 A1) discloses embedded XML documents.

Stapp et al. (U.S. 2004/0015832 A1) discloses embedded XML tags.

17. This action is **non-final** because new grounds of rejection have been made to substantially unamended claims. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Meucci at (571) 272-3892. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell, can be reached at (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for this Group is 571-273-8300.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [michael.meucci@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35

Art Unit: 2142

U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Beatriz Prieto
BEATRIZ PRIETO
PRIMARY EXAMINER